

REMARKS

Claims 10, 16 and 18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. Although applicants do not agree with the Examiner, applicants have cancelled claims 10 and 16 in order to expedite prosecution of the present application. With respect to claim 18, applicants have amended the claim to refer to a printed storage medium. In contrast to the Examiner's assertions, printed materials --such as pre-printed and print-on-demand advertisements-- are a form of a storage medium as defined by applicants. The Examiner is respectfully reminded it has long been established that an applicant may be his own lexicographer in establishing the meaning of terms.

Claim 18 also stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. It is believed the amendment to the claim discussed above is sufficient to overcome this rejection.

Applicants have cancelled claims 1-3, 5, 6, 9, 11, 13, 15 and rewritten claims 14 and 19 as independent claims in order to expedite the prosecution of the present application. The cancellation of the claims shall not be construed as an admission by the applicants as to whether the rejection of the claims is correct. Applicants have cancelled the claims in order to reduce the number of issues for consideration and may, at their discretion, decide to pursue the cancelled claims at a later date through the filing of a continuation application.

Claims 14 and 19 were previously rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ko in view of King and further in view of Lipson. Applicants note the Examiner has failed to provide any specific reasoning in support of the rejection of claims 14 and 19. Accordingly, the Examiner has failed to establish a prima facie case of obviousness as required under 35 U.S.C. § 103. Applicants note the duty of establishing a prima facie case falls with the Examiner. Applicants are not required to guess as to the Examiner's intentions with regard to cited references. Absent a specific showing as to why the combination of references would render the claimed kiosk obvious, the rejection is improper and should be withdrawn.

Further, as the Examiner has failed to provide any reasoning with respect to the rejection of claims 14 and 19, it would be improper to issue a final rejection of the claims without giving applicants an opportunity to respond to a

properly couched argument. Thus, if the Examiner intends to maintain the rejection, applicants submit final rejection of the claims would not be proper.

Applicants believe, however, that none of the references of record disclose or suggest the kiosk as set forth in claims 14 and 19. The remaining claims, including new claims 20 – 29, depend either directly or indirectly on claims 14 and 19. Accordingly, all of the claims in this case are believed to be in condition for allowance, notice of which is respectfully urged.

Respectfully submitted,

/Marc A. Rossi/ 11/06/2008

Attorney for Applicant(s)
Registration No. 31,923

Eastman Kodak Company
343 State Street
Rochester, NY 14650
Telephone: 585-726-4656
Facsimile: 585-477-4646